UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/472,762	12/27/1999	CARL H. HAUSER	D/99477	9175

7590   03/24/2004

PATENT DOCUMENTATION
XEROX CORPORATION
100 CLINTON AVE. S., XEROX SQ. 20TH FLOOR
ROCHESTER, NY 14644

EXAMINER
LIN, KENNY S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/472,762	HAUSER, CARL H.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Kenny Lin	2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _06 February 2004_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-8_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-8_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-8 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   Claims 1, 3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Unger et al

(hereinafter Unger), US Patent 5,721,910.

4.   Unger was cited on the previous office action.

5.   As per claims 1, 3 and 5, Unger taught the invention substantially as claimed including a

computer-implemented method/computer program product having a computer-readable medium

holding computer-executable instructions for performing a method for managing a plurality of

personal documents (col.2, lines 58-63, col.13, lines 2-15), comprising

        a.   loading one of the plurality of personal documents into storage, said loaded

            document having a category (col.2, lines 58-65);

        b.   determining the document category (col.3, lines 9-15);

c. receiving at least one processing rule, wherein the rule is associated with the

document category (col.3, lines 22-28, col.4, lines 44-57, col.7, lines 40-46), and

wherein said processing rule embodies information flow knowledge between said

loaded document and other of said plurality of personal documents (col.4, lines

44-57, col.5, lines 17-35, col.7, lines 40-46); and

d. processing said loaded document according to the processing rule (col.3, lines 22-

28, col.4, lines 44-57, col.7, lines 40-46).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

7.   Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Unger et al

(hereinafter Unger), US Patent 5,721,910.

8.   As per claim 7, Unger taught the invention substantially as claimed including a method

comprising:

a. Accessing, on the one or more first computers, computer-executable instructions,

which when executed by a computer (col.2, lines 58-63, col.13, lines 2-15),

perform the steps of:

    i.   loading one of a plurality of personal documents into storage, said loaded document having a category (col.2, lines 58-65);

    ii.   determining the document category (col.3, lines 9-15);

    iii.   receiving at least one processing rule, wherein the rule is associated with the document category (col.3, lines 22-28, col.4, lines 44-57, col.7, lines 40-46), and wherein said processing rule embodies information flow knowledge between said loaded document and other of said plurality of personal documents (col.4, lines 44-57, col.5, lines 17-35, col.7, lines 40-46); and

    iv.   processing said loaded document according to the processing rule (col.3, lines 22-28, col.4, lines 44-57, col.7, lines 40-46).

9.   Unger did not specifically teach the system to transfer the computer-executable instructions from the one or more first computers to the second computer connected to the one or more first computer through a communications medium. However, Unger taught that the method can be implemented in a computer system (col.4, lines 33-43) and that the documents may be on a CD-ROM, in a database, a LAN/WAN or on the Internet (col.1, lines 49-54, col.6, lines 51-55). Furthermore, Unger taught to search for documents and electronically store the results in tables (col.5, lines 56-66) wherein the documents may be stored remotely over the Internet (col.1, lines 49-54, col.6, lines 51-55). Official Notice is taken that both the concept and advantage of transferring computer-executable instruction from one computer to another is well known and expected in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to

transfer data files or executable instruction from one computer to another through a medium in a

computer system especially in obtaining/requesting data files in LAN/WAN or Internet networks

from remote databases. One would have been motivated to send a requesting/searching

instruction to a remote computer containing databases to obtain the desired documents from the

database. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to allow users to transfer the computer-executable instruction contained in Unger's

system from one computer to another through a communication medium for sharing purposes.

10.   Claims 2, 4, 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Unger et al (hereinafter Unger), U.S. Patent 5,721,910, in view of MacPhail, U.S. Patent

5,107,419.

11.   MacPhail was cited on the previous office action.

12.   As per claims 2, 4, 6 and 8, Unger taught the invention substantially as claimed in claims

1, 3, 5 and 7. Unger did not specifically teach the processing rule to include retention criteria for

determining how long to save the document. MacPhail taught a document classification system

to have the processing rule to include retention criteria for determining how long to save the

document (col.1, lines 59-63, col.3, lines 6-9, 19-21, 26-33). It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Unger

and MacPhail because MacPhail's teaching of using retention criteria to determine whether the

documents stored in the document storage exceeds expiration date can help the processing rule in

Unger's system to automatically delete the to documents that are no longer needed to save

system storing space (col.1, lines 59-63).

Conclusion

13.   Applicant's arguments, filed on 2/6/2004, with respect to claims 1-8 have been

considered but are not persuasive and are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

14.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

15.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kenny Lin whose telephone number is (703)305-0438. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM Tuesday to Friday and every other Monday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. Additionally, the fax numbers for

Group 2100 are as follows:

Official Responses: (703) 872-9306

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-6121.

ksl
March 19, 2004

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100